UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,587	08/05/2003	Wayne Minns	N81510/LPK	8946

1333 7590 06/28/2007
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
PATENT LEGAL STAFF
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER	
DICKERSON, CHAD S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/634,587	MINNS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chad Dickerson	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *8/5/2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *8/5/2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verghese '364 (EP No 1096364 A2) in view of Hewitt '061 (US Pat No 7016061).

Re claim 1: Verghese '364 discloses an estimation of time to complete a print job, said method comprising:

generating meta-data from printing instructions (i.e. in the broadest sense of the word, meta-data is data that describes the content, or aspect of an actual data item. When a user's computer transmits printing instructions to a printer, the instructions are converted into a PDL (page description language). The PDL is data used by the computer to communicate with the printer, in a language the printer can understand, in order to describe the original data, which comprises a file for printing, that the printer can perform processing with in order to output a file. In short the PDL is "data about data" that allows the printer to describe a document and print the document in the manner of that description; see paragraphs [0016] and [0017]);

calculating a complexity prediction for each of said printing instructions (i.e. the complexity of the print job depends on several factors, such as the number of vectors,

size and bit depth of raster images and the number of complex graphic operations. The efficiency of the printer (110) depends on the code or instructions utilized to perform the tasks above. The complexity metric is calculated using the contents that are in the print instructions to form a page or image; see fig. 2; paragraphs [0019] and [0028]-[0030]);

estimating a processing time for each of said printing instructions based on said complexity prediction (i.e. based on the complexity metric the processing time of a page is estimated using the equation in paragraph [0030]. This is performed each time print job is spooled in the spool file (213) for a submitted print job. The estimated processing time is performed on a page-by-page basis; see fig. 2; paragraphs [0025]-[0033]).

However, Verghese '364 fails to teach evaluating said printing instructions based on said processing time.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hewitt '061. Hewitt '061 discloses evaluating said printing instructions based on said processing time (i.e. in Hewitt '061, the system evaluates the printing instructions based on the processing time and makes the determination whether to perform a print processing operation, such as RIPing a document, on the host computer (12) or on the imaging device (14). This performs the feature of evaluating printing instructions based on the processing instructions; see fig. 1-4; col. 7, lines 51-67 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Therefore, in view of Hewitt '061, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to evaluating the printing instructions based on the processing time in order to provide printed output at a maximum rate (as stated in Hewitt '061 col. 2, lines 32-45).

Re claim 2: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said evaluating produces one or more of:

a cost analysis of said printing instructions (i.e. when the system looks at the printing instructions to develop a complexity metric, a time cost associated with the print instructions of a page is produced in order to have all the factors in the complexity metric calculation. A time cost is also developed for the time estimation as a cost analysis of processing a page in the printer; see paragraphs [0028]-[0031]).

However, Verghese '364 fails to teach an order of processing said printing instructions.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hewitt '061. Hewitt '061 discloses an order of processing said printing instructions (i.e. when the system in Hewitt evaluates the processing time in regards to the host computer (12) and imaging device (14), the system determines the order of processing the print instructions by deciding whether the image data is RIPed in the host computer (12) or in the imaging device (14) based on the processing time; see fig. 1-4; col. 7, lines 51-67 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Therefore, in view of Hewitt '061, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have an order of processing said printing instructions in order to determine on a job-by-job basis the image processing for a print job (as stated in Hewitt '061 col. 2, lines 32-45).

Re claim 3: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said processing of said printing instructions includes one or more of raster image processing and spooling (i.e. in the system, an image is spooled on a page-by-page basis while a complexity metric is calculated using the spooled data. Also, when an image is formed into a bitmap image, the image is rasterized. The feature of raster image processing of an image is performed in the invention of Verghese '364; see paragraphs [0018]).

Re claim 4: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said generating of said meta-data comprises examining one or more of font attributes, font size, vector complexity, digital image content, digital image size, and digital image type (i.e. the metadata that is examined in the system is the vector complexity of an image, image size and the graphic operations portion of the invention, which is analogous to the font attributes or the image type; see paragraphs [0018] and [0019]).

Re claim 5: Verghese '364 discloses the method; further comprising supplying an accuracy factor for said complexity prediction (i.e. the time cost of printing the bitmap (B_t) and applying a complex operation (C_t) are both analogous to an accuracy factor because these factors are set as default values during the printer manufacture and are dependent on the characteristics of the particular printer. These factors keep the complexity metric accurate in terms of being accurate of estimating the most correct complexity metric for the particular printer; see paragraphs [0028]-[0032]).

Re claim 6: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said accuracy factor controls a processing precision of said complexity prediction calculation (i.e. the closer the values of the time costs listed in paragraph [0029] are to the particular printer's characteristics, the more precise the complexity metric can be calculated to help estimate a more precise estimation of the time the system takes to process an image; see paragraphs [0028]-[0032]).

Re claim 7: Verghese '364 discloses the method, further comprising adding a feedback factor to said complexity prediction based on responses from downstream functions (i.e. when calculating the complexity metric, the system provides a number representing the complex operations on a page (C) or a bitmap complexity on a page (B) and these factors are all added to in the equation to estimate the complexity metric. These are used to provide more of an accurate estimate of a complexity metric. These operations are performed in the printer driver, which is a downstream element that performs the function of adding a factor to the complexity metric equation after information has passed through the application phase and providing of a print job request by the operating system in the invention; see paragraphs [0022]-[0032]).

Re claim 8: Verghese '364 discloses an estimation of time to complete a print job, said method comprising:

generating meta-data from printing instructions (i.e. in the broadest since of the word, meta-data is data that describes the content, or aspect of an actual data item.

When a user's computer transmits printing instructions to a printer, the instructions are converted into a PDL (page description language). The PDL is data used by the computer to communicate with the printer, in a language the printer can understand, in order to describe the original data, which comprises a file for printing, that the printer can perform processing with in order to output a file. In short the PDL is "data about data" that allows the printer to describe a document and print the document in the manner of that description; see paragraphs [0016] and [0017]);

examining one or more of font attributes, font size, vector complexity, digital image content, digital image size, digital image type to calculate a complexity prediction for each of said printing instructions (i.e. the metadata that is examined in the system is the vector complexity of an image, image size and the graphic operations portion of the invention, which is analogous to the font attributes or the image type; see paragraphs [0018] and [0019]);

estimating a processing time for each of said printing instructions based on said complexity prediction (i.e. based on the complexity metric the processing time of a page is estimated using the equation in paragraph [0030]. This is performed each time print job is spooled in the spool file (213) for a submitted print job. The estimated processing time is performed on a page-by-page basis; see fig. 2; paragraphs [0025]-[0033]).

However, Verghese '364 fails to teach evaluating said printing instructions based on said processing time.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hewitt '061. Hewitt '061 discloses evaluating said printing instructions based on said processing time (i.e. in

Hewitt '061, the system evaluates the printing instructions based on the processing time and makes the determination whether to perform a print processing operation, such as RIPing a document, on the host computer (12) or on the imaging device (14). This performs the feature of evaluating printing instructions based on the processing instructions; see fig. 1-4; col. 7, lines 51-67 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Therefore, in view of Hewitt '061, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to evaluating the printing instructions based on the processing time in order to provide printed output at a maximum rate (as stated in Hewitt '061 col. 2, lines 32-45).

Re claim 9: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said evaluating produces one or more of:

a cost analysis of said printing instructions (i.e. when the system looks at the printing instructions to develop a complexity metric, a time cost associated with the print instructions of a page is produced in order to have all the factors in the complexity metric calculation. A time cost is also developed for the time estimation as a cost analysis of processing a page in the printer; see paragraphs [0028]-[0031]).

However, Verghese '364 fails to teach an order of processing said printing instructions.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hewitt '061. Hewitt '061 discloses an order of processing said printing instructions (i.e. when the system in Hewitt evaluates the processing time in regards to the host computer (12) and imaging

device (14), the system determines the order of processing the print instructions by deciding whether the image data is RIPed in the host computer (12) or in the imaging device (14) based on the processing time; see fig. 1-4; col. 7, lines 51-67 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Therefore, in view of Hewitt '061, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have an order of processing said printing instructions in order to determine on a job-by-job basis the image processing for a print job (as stated in Hewitt '061 col. 2, lines 32-45).

Re claim 10: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said processing of said printing instructions includes one or more of raster image processing and spooling (i.e. in the system, an image is spooled on a page-by-page basis while a complexity metric is calculated using the spooled data. Also, when an image is formed into a bitmap image, the image is rasterized. The feature of raster image processing of an image is performed in the invention of Verghese '364; see paragraphs [0018]).

Re claim 11: Verghese '364 discloses the method, further comprising supplying an accuracy factor for said complexity prediction (i.e. the time cost of printing the bitmap (B_t) and applying a complex operation (C_t) are both analogous to an accuracy factor because these factors are set as default values during the printer manufacture and are dependent on the characteristics of the particular printer. These factors keep the

complexity metric accurate in terms of being accurate of estimating the most correct complexity metric for the particular printer; see paragraphs [0028]-[0032]).

Re claim 12: Verghese '364 discloses the method, wherein said accuracy factor controls a processing precision of said complexity prediction calculation (i.e. the closer the values of the time costs listed in paragraph [0029] are to the particular printer's characteristics, the more precise the complexity metric can be calculated to help estimate a more precise estimation of the time the system takes to process an image; see paragraphs [0028]-[0032]).

Re claim 13: Verghese '364 discloses the method, further comprising adding a feedback factor to said complexity prediction based on responses from downstream functions (i.e. when calculating the complexity metric, the system provides a number representing the complex operations on a page (C) or a bitmap complexity on a page (B) and these factors are all added to in the equation to estimate the complexity metric. These are used to provide more of an accurate estimate of a complexity metric. These operations are performed in the printer driver, which is a downstream element that performs the function of adding a factor to the complexity metric equation after information has passed through the application phase and providing of a print job request by the operating system in the invention; see paragraphs [0022]-[0032]).

Re claim 14: Verghese '364 discloses an estimation of time to complete a print job, said method comprising:

generating meta-data from printing instructions (i.e. in the broadest since of the word, meta-data is data that describes the content, or aspect of an actual data item. When a user's computer transmits printing instructions to a printer, the instructions are converted into a PDL (page description language). The PDL is data used by the computer to communicate with the printer, in a language the printer can understand, in order to describe the original data, which comprises a file for printing, that the printer can perform processing with in order to output a file. In short the PDL is "data about data" that allows the printer to describe a document and print the document in the manner of that description; see paragraphs [0016] and [0017]);

calculating a complexity prediction for each of said printing instructions (i.e. the complexity of the print job depends on several factors, such as the number of vectors, size and bit depth of raster images and the number of complex graphic operations. The efficiency of the printer (110) depends on the code or instructions utilized to perform the tasks above. The complexity metric is calculated using the contents that are in the print instructions to form a page or image; see fig. 2; paragraphs [0019] and [0028]-[0030]);

estimating a processing time for each of said printing instructions based on said complexity prediction (i.e. based on the complexity metric the processing time of a page is estimated using the equation in paragraph [0030]. This is performed each time print job is spooled in the spool file (213) for a submitted print job. The estimated processing time is performed on a page-by-page basis; see fig. 2; paragraphs [0025]-[0033]).

However, Verghese '364 fails to teach evaluating said printing instructions based on said processing time.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hewitt '061. Hewitt '061 discloses evaluating said printing instructions based on said processing time (i.e. in Hewitt '061, the system evaluates the printing instructions based on the processing time and makes the determination whether to perform a print processing operation, such as RIPing a document, on the host computer (12) or on the imaging device (14). This performs the feature of evaluating printing instructions based on the processing instructions; see fig. 1-4; col. 7, lines 51-67 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Therefore, in view of Hewitt '061, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to evaluating the printing instructions based on the processing time in order to provide printed output at a maximum rate (as stated in Hewitt '061 col. 2, lines 32-45).

Re claim 15: Verghese '364 discloses the program storage device, wherein said evaluating produces one or more of:

a cost analysis of said printing instructions (i.e. when the system looks at the printing instructions to develop a complexity metric, a time cost associated with the print instructions of a page is produced in order to have all the factors in the complexity metric calculation. A time cost is also developed for the time estimation as a cost analysis of processing a page in the printer; see paragraphs [0028]-[0031]).

However, Verghese '364 fails to teach an order of processing said printing instructions.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hewitt '061. Hewitt '061 discloses an order of processing said printing instructions (i.e. when the system in Hewitt evaluates the processing time in regards to the host computer (12) and imaging device (14), the system determines the order of processing the print instructions by deciding whether the image data is RIPed in the host computer (12) or in the imaging device (14) based on the processing time; see fig. 1-4; col. 7, lines 51-67 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Therefore, in view of Hewitt '061, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have an order of processing said printing instructions in order to determine on a job-by-job basis the image processing for a print job (as stated in Hewitt '061 col. 2, lines 32-45).

Re claim 16: Verghese '364 discloses the program storage device, wherein said processing of said printing instructions includes one or more of raster image processing and spooling (i.e. in the system, an image is spooled on a page-by-page basis while a complexity metric is calculated using the spooled data. Also, when an image is formed into a bitmap image, the image is rasterized. The feature of raster image processing of an image is performed in the invention of Verghese '364; see paragraphs [0018]).

Re claim 17: Verghese '364 discloses the program storage device, wherein said generating of said meta-data comprises examining one or more of font attributes, font size, vector complexity, digital image content, digital image size, and digital image type (i.e. the metadata that is examined in the system is the vector complexity of an image, image size and the graphic operations portion of the invention, which is analogous to the font attributes or the image type; see paragraphs [0018] and [0019]).

Re claim 18: Verghese '364 discloses the program storage device, further comprising supplying an accuracy factor for said complexity prediction (i.e. the time cost of printing the bitmap (B_t) and applying a complex operation (C_t) are both analogous to an accuracy factor because these factors are set as default values during the printer manufacture and are dependent on the characteristics of the particular printer. These factors keep the complexity metric accurate in terms of being accurate of estimating the most correct complexity metric for the particular printer; see paragraphs [0028]-[0032]).

Re claim 19: Verghese '364 discloses the program storage device, wherein said accuracy factor controls a processing precision of said complexity prediction calculation (i.e. the closer the values of the time costs listed in paragraph [0029] are to the particular printer's characteristics, the more precise the complexity metric can be calculated to help estimate a more precise estimation of the time the system takes to process an image; see paragraphs [0028]-[0032]).

Re claim 20: Verghese '364 discloses the program storage device, further comprising adding a feedback factor to said complexity prediction based on responses from downstream functions (i.e. when calculating the complexity metric, the system provides a number representing the complex operations on a page (C) or a bitmap complexity on a page (B) and these factors are all added to in the equation to estimate the complexity metric. These are used to provide more of an accurate estimate of a complexity metric. These operations are performed in the printer driver, which is a downstream element that performs the function of adding a factor to the complexity metric equation after information has passed through the application phase and providing of a print job request by the operating system in the invention; see paragraphs [0022]-[0032]).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. King '286 (US Pat No 6529286) discloses a system that uses a complexity factor to estimate the task allocation property that determines how long a document is processed in the system. Other factors are used to calculate the Task allocation property in order to make the property more accurate in estimating the period in which the document is processed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Dickerson whose telephone number is (571)-270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Thur. 9:00-6:30 Fri. 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Aung Moe can be reached on (571)- 272-7314. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CD/CD
Chad Dickerson
June 20, 2007

AUNG S. MOE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
6/21/07

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/634,587	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination MINNS ET AL.	
	Examiner Chad Dickerson	Art Unit 2625	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-7,016,061	03-2006	Hewitt, James A.	358/1.15
*	B	US-6,529,286	03-2003	King, Edward Winslow	358/1.14
*	C	US-5,471,564	11-1995	Dennis et al.	358/1.15
*	D	US-6,816,276	11-2004	Sugano, Takashi	358/1.15
*	E	US-2004/0012797	01-2004	Letellier, Nolan Wayne	358/1.9
*	F	US-6,956,667	10-2005	Delhoune et al.	358/1.18
*	G	US-6,709,176	03-2004	Gotoh et al.	400/61
*	H	US-2002/0135799	09-2002	Simpson et al.	358/1.15
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N	EP 1096364 A2	05-2001	European Patent	VERGHESE, PHILIP C	
	O	JP 2001331293 A	11-2001	Japan	YONEDA, HIROKO	
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.